AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Figure 1 has been amended as follows. Please approve the drawing as amended. No new content was added; however elements 103, 105, and 117 were redrawn to better comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.84. Please replace the sheet with the previously amended Figure 1 with the attached sheet showing the currently amended Figure 1.

Remarks

Claims 24-28 and 40 are in the application of which claim 40 is in independent form.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Burstein/Burgin

Claims 19-21, 24, 27, 29-31, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burstein (US 6,268,716) in view of Burgin (US 4,327,298).

Claim 19 is canceled and replaced with claim 40. Previous independent claim 29 is canceled.

Claim 40 included limitations not found in Burstein or Burgin. For example, in claim 40, the primary and second regulator are coupled to the output node in parallel and there are a first and second power source. In Burstein, the voltage regulators are in series and in Burgin there is only one power source. More specifically, the voltage regulators disclosed in Burgin are connected in series as the output of second voltage regulator (17) is connected to the input of the first voltage regulator (23). (See Figure 1 and column 2, lines 20-43.) The arrangement of claim 40 allows the plurality of voltage regulators to provide power to the load in a fundamentally different manner than in Burgin -- the load can be powered by any combination of the plurality of voltage regulators.

Claim 40 further recites the following limitations not found in Burstein or Burgin:

"a first transistor receiving an input from the primary voltage regulator, wherein the first transistor is coupled to a first terminal of a first inductor, and a second terminal of the first inductor is connected to the output node, such that the primary and secondary voltage regulators are coupled to the output node in parallel;

a second transistor receiving an input from the secondary voltage regulator wherein the second transistor is coupled to a first terminal of a second inductor and a second terminal of the second inductor is connected to the output node;

wherein, the secondary voltage regulator has a greater power capacity than the primary voltage regulator;

wherein, the voltage supplied by the secondary voltage regulator to the output node is greater than the voltage provided by the primary voltage regulator; and the apparatus further comprises:

first and second feedback networks to detect power supplied to the output node and to control the primary and secondary voltage regulators, and to detect if the second power source is available, and to detect if a load power reaches a threshold level, and wherein the first and second feedback networks monitor operating conditions of the apparatus, and wherein the first and second feedback networks enable the secondary voltage regulator to supply additional power to the output node if the second power

source is available and the load power reaches a threshold level or the operating conditions require the additional power." (Emphasis added.)

Burstein and Burgin do not teach this transistor arrangement.

Further, as shown, claim 40 recites: "the secondary voltage regulator to supply additional power to the output node if the second power source is available and the load power reaches a threshold level or the operating conditions require the additional power." This is not taught be either Burstein or Burgin which make no mention of operating conditions, only threshold (see Burstein, column 6 line 63 – column 7 line 31). As stated in the specification of the application, operation conditions can comprise of power source conditions, thermal environment, circuit board layout, etc. Page 7, lines 21-23. Thus, this is an additional reason why the claims should be allowed.

Dependent claims 24-28 should allowed for at least the same reason as claim 40.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(A) BURSTEIN/BURGIN/YANAGISAWA

Claim 25 dependents from claim 40 which is shown to be patentable over Burstein and Burgin. Yanagisawa is provided to show a third regulator but does not other teach the invention of claim 40. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 25 should be withdrawn.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(A) BURSTEIN/BURGIN/YANAGISAWA/TRACY

Claim 26 dependents from claim 40 which is shown to be patentable over Burstein and Burgin. Tracy is provided to shown active heat dissipation but does not other teach the invention of claim 40. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 26 should be withdrawn.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(A) BURSTEIN/BURGIN/NORRIS

Claim 28 dependents from claim 40 which is shown to be patentable over Burstein and Burgin. Norris is provided to show a load with performance modes but does not other teach the invention of claim 40. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 28 should be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully submits the present application is in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: 6/25/2007

/Alan K. Aldous/
Alan K. Aldous
Attorney for the Intel Corporation
Reg. No. 31,905

Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(503) 439-8778